



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,491	04/04/2001	Scott S. Snibbe	YCMIP001	6835
21912	7590	05/19/2004	EXAMINER	
VAN PELT & YI LLP 10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200 CUPERTINO, CA 95014			ZHOU, TING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	do
DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/828,491	Applicant(s)	SNIBBE ET AL.
Examiner	Ting Zhou	Art Unit	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. The 12 April 2004 have been received and entered. Claims 1-29 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3, 7-17, 19-20 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson et al. U.S. Patent 6,507,865.

Referring to claims 1, 19, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28 and 29, Hanson et al. teach a method comprising providing a user interface to a digital device network (column 3, lines 15-17), the interface configured to enable a user to contribute collaboratively online with other users in a collaborative community to create a digital media artifact (column 2, lines 60-

Art Unit: 2173

67 and column 3, lines 24-27 and 34-48), submitting collaborative user contributions to the online digital media artifact received prior to the deadline for production by a third party into a final media product (for example, submitting a message to an online group greeting card prior to the send date) (column 15 , lines 15-17 and further shown in Figure 11), and tracking a genealogy of the digital media artifact including a history of the digital media artifact and collaborative user contributions (tracking the comments and changes made by other participants to the message) (column 7, lines 30-37 and column 13, lines 38-43). This is further recited in the online group collaboration greeting card system in column 14, lines 43-51, column 15, lines 33-46 and further shown in Figures 9-13.

Referring to claim 2, Hanson et al. teach the third party being part of the collaborative community that participated in the creation of the digital media artifact (the electronic medium can provide a background or “canvas” to which participants can add content) (column 14, lines 43-51).

Referring to claim 3, Hanson et al. teach the third party not being part of the collaborative community that participated in the creation of the digital media artifact (instead of providing a canvas for use by the participants, the electronic medium can be updated instead by a variety of external sources) (column 5, lines 9-14).

Referring to claim 7, Hanson et al. teach the media product being one or more of an animation, television program, song, motion picture or commercial (streaming media such as television programs or commercials) (column 3, lines 23-26 and column 5, lines 9-11).

Referring to claim 8, Hanson et al. teach the media product being a special edition product (column 3, lines 23-26 and column 5, lines 9-11).

Referring to claim 9, Hanson et al. teach the user contributions including one or more of plots, characters, settings, situations, sound clips, drawings, artwork and video clip (users can input content such as images and audio clips) (column 14, lines 43-51).

Referring to claim 10, Hanson et al. teach the user contributions based on materials from a fixed-asset database (selections from predetermined or predefined data can be made by the user) (column 15, lines 1-17).

Referring to claim 11, Hanson et al. teach the user contributions including contributions to a working material asset database available to other members of the community (column 13, lines 38-43).

Referring to claim 12, Hanson et al. teach tracking the user contributions to a collaborative digital media artifact (tracking the comments and changes made by other participants to the message) (column 7, lines 30-37 and column 13, lines 38-43).

Referring to claim 13, Hanson et al. teach displaying the modification history and percentage of contribution from multiple parties to the collaborative digital media artifact (displaying and tracking the history of modifications and contributions from users) (column 7, lines 30-37, column 13, lines 38-43 and further shown in Figures 9 and 17).

Referring to claim 14, Hanson et al. teach the users in the online collaborative community providing identity information in a user profile viewable by other members of the community (users are represented by their network addresses and names and their names can be viewed with their contributions by the members of the community)

(column 3, lines 34-48, column 7, lines 31-37 and further shown by reference character "1140" in Figure 16).

Referring to claim 15, Hanson et al. teach tracking user activity in the online collaborative community (tracking the comments and changes made by other participants to the message) (column 7, lines 30-37 and column 13, lines 38-43).

Referring to claim 16, Hanson et al. teach correlating user activity with user profile data to determine demographic information indicative of user preferences (for example, comments and recommendations for the Club Stock Tracker are associated with a particular user, with his recommendations being indicative of certain preferences) (Figure 16).

Referring to claim 17, Hanson et al. teach an interface to a digital device network (column 3, lines 10-19), the interface configured to enable a user to view a plurality of digital media artifacts collaboratively created by members of the online community, and to select from among the plurality of artifacts, one or more artifacts to modify (allows the users to view greeting cards created by members of the online community and modify them to add their comments and signatures) (column 14, lines 43-51, column 15, lines 33-56 and further shown in Figure 9).

Referring to claim 24, Hanson et al. teach the network of digital devices comprising one or more clients running front-end software, the software providing a user interface to the digital computer network, the interface configured to enable a user to contribute collaboratively online with other users to create a digital media artifact, one or more servers running back-end software, the software configured to interface with the front-end software to coordinate the contributions of a plurality of users, one or more

databases configured for storage of digital media and associated information, and application program interfaces (APIs) and middleware (server-side software components) configured to communicate between the one or more clients, servers and databases (column 3, lines 34-48, column 6, lines 23-67, column 26, lines 53-67 and column 27, lines 1-18). This is further shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Referring to claim 25, Hanson et al. teach the digital device network comprising one or more of personal computers, interactive television devices, cable boxes and cable modems (column 6, lines 34-47).

Referring to claim 26, Hanson et al. teach the digital device network further comprising one or more of wireless devices, cellular telephones and personal digital assistants (column 6, lines 34-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-6, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al. U.S. Patent 6,507,865 and Knight U.S. Patent 6,515,681.

Referring to claim 4, Hanson et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claim 1 above. However, they fail to explicitly teach the submission of only the most popular user contributions for production. Knight teaches an online user collaboration method

Art Unit: 2173

(Knight: column 4, lines 62-67) similar to that of Hanson et al. In addition, Knight further teaches the submission of only the most popular user contributions, as determined by explicit or implicit voting by community members (retrieving and displaying only information indicated as of the most interest to the user) (Knight: column 6, lines 15-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hanson et al. and Knight before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the online collaboration method of Hanson et al. to include the submission of the most popular contributions, as taught by Knight. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to save users time from having to view unrelated and unimportant information; by only submitting information that are of importance or interest to the user, the final product is guaranteed to be satisfactory and pertinent to the user's needs.

Referring to claim 5, Hanson et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claim 1 above. Specifically, Hanson et al. teach tracking the contributions of users in the collaborative community (tracking the comments and changes made by other participants to the message) (Hanson et al.: column 7, lines 30-37 and column 13, lines 38-43). However, they fail to explicitly teach determining the popularity of user contributions by tracking, viewing and/or use of the contributions by other users in the collaborative community. Knight teaches an online user collaboration method (Knight: column 4, lines 62-67) similar to that of Hanson et al. In addition, Knight further teaches a tracking system that tracks the frequency of information usage to determine popularity (Knight: column 6, lines 22-30 and lines 59-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hanson et al. and Knight before him at the time

the invention was made, to modify the online collaboration method of Hanson et al. to include the use of a tracking system to determine the popularity of user contributions, taught by Knight. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to save users time from having to view unrelated and unimportant information; by only submitting information that are of importance or interest to the user, the final product is guaranteed to be satisfactory and pertinent to the user's needs.

Referring to claim 6, Hanson et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claim 1 above. Specifically, Hanson et al. teach tracking the contributions of users in the collaborative community (tracking the comments and changes made by other participants to the message) (Hanson et al.: column 7, lines 30-37 and column 13, lines 38-43). However, they fail to explicitly teach a quality rating system of the contributions of users in the collaborative community. Knight teaches an online user collaboration method (Knight: column 4, lines 62-67) similar to that of Hanson et al. In addition, Knight further teaches determining the popularity of a user contribution to the collaborative media artifact by tracking the assignment of a quality rating (display of a ranking system identifying the most popular information) (Knight: column 18, lines 44-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hanson et al. and Knight before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the online collaboration method of Hanson et al. to include determining the popularity of user contributions through a rating system, taught by Knight. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to save users time from having to view unrelated and unimportant information; by only submitting information that are of importance or

interest to the user, the final product is guaranteed to be satisfactory and pertinent to the user's needs.

Referring to claim 18, Hanson et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 17 above. Specifically, Hanson et al. teach providing an interface to enable a user to view a plurality of digital media artifacts collaboratively created by members of the online collaborative community (Hanson et al.: column 3, lines 10-19, column 14, lines 43-51, column 15, lines 33-56 and further shown in Figure 9). However, they fail to explicitly teach an interface that uses statistical sampling to select the plurality of artifacts presented to the user. Knight teaches an interface enabling an online user collaboration system (Knight: column 4, lines 62-67 and further shown in Figure 5) similar to that of Hanson et al. In addition, Knight further teaches the use of statistical sampling through picking a subset of information that matches the user's query request to display, namely, the most popular and relevant information (Knight: column 6, lines 15-18 and column 16, lines 12-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hanson et al. and Knight before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the online collaboration interface taught by Hanson et al. to include the statistical sampling of Knight. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to prevent users from being overwhelmed with too much information; this way, users will only receive a subset of the database, making it easier for them to view and navigate through the information.

Referring to claim 21, while Hanson et al. teach all of the limitation as applied to claim 19 above, they fail to explicitly teach selecting a subset of the collaborative contributions. Knight teaches an online user collaboration method (Knight: column 4,

lines 62-67) similar to that of Hanson et al. In addition, Knight further selecting a portion of the contributions from the collaborative community, i.e. only the most popular information or information of the most interest to users (Knight: column 6, lines 15-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hanson et al. and Knight before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the online collaboration method of Hanson et al. to include the selection of a subset of contributions, as taught by Knight. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to prevent users from being overwhelmed with too much information; this way, users will only receive a subset of the database, making it easier for them to view and navigate through the information.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2173

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (703) 305-0328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 27, 2004

Art Unit: 2173

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (703) 305-0328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 27, 2004

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

